

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3 and 7-17 are pending. Claims 2 and 4-6 were canceled by prior amendment without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 7-11 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,185,530 of Ittycheriah et al. ("Ittycheriah") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,667 of Wactler et al. ("Wactler"). Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ittycheriah in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,348 of Besling et al. ("Besling").

Ittycheriah describes a method and apparatus that determines potential acoustic confusion between at least on new word and at least a portion of existing words of a vocabulary speech recognition system. *See* Ittycheriah, Abstract. Ittycheriah describes vocabulary expansion using a vocabulary expansion facility 20. A speech recognition system 10 includes a speech utterance pre-processor 12 operatively coupled via an acoustic front-end 14 to a speech recognition engine 16. *See* Ittycheriah, column 3, lines 35-43.

The present Office Action acknowledges that Ittycheriah fails to "teach providing an audio module with vocabulary data in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network," but relies on disparate portions of Wactler as describing this claimed feature. Office Action, Detailed Action, pages 3-4. Wactler describes that an offline portion 12 of a digital video library system 10 creates a digital library 36 using raw video material 16 comprising audio data 18 and video data 20. The digital library 36 is accessed by end users via an online portion 14. Wactler, column 6, lines 12-18, 50-54; Fig. 1. With regard to Wactler's disclosure of streaming network data identified in the

Office Action (Wactler, column 16, line 33-column 17, line 13), Wactler is describing a network architecture 80 for delivery of continuous video to end users from a digital video/audio archive 82.

Independent claim 1 of the present application recites training a speech recognition system “by acoustic training using an audio module” by “providing the audio module with vocabulary data in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network.” Independent claim 16 recites “a computer-based audio module including a speech synthesis unit configured to receive speech data in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network” wherein “the speech data is spoken into the vocabulary database in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database.” It is respectfully submitted that neither Ittycheriah nor Wactler, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests providing an audio module used in speech recognition system training or expanding with speech data in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. As noted above, the Office Action acknowledges that Ittycheriah does not teach these features. Nor does Ittycheriah suggest these features.

With regard to Wactler, that reference merely describes that an offline portion 12 receives raw video material 16 comprising audio data 18 and video data 20 to create a digital library 36. Wactler describes delivering content from the digital library 36 via an online portion 14. Wactler, column 6, lines 12-18, 50-54; Fig. 1. Wactler, at column 16, line 33-column 17, line 13, merely describes a network architecture 80 that delivers the content to end users from the digital video/audio archive 82. The audio data 18 of Wactler is used offline to create digital library 36; the audio data 18 is not provided “in a streaming mode,” as required by claims 1 and 16. Nowhere does Wactler disclose or suggest providing vocabulary data in a streaming mode from a telecommunication network to an audio module used to train or expand a speech recognition system, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. Nor does Besling teach or suggest the above-recited features missing from Ittycheriah and Wactler.

Because each of Ittycheriah, Wactler, and Besling fails to teach or suggest the above-recited features of independent claims 1 and 16, no combination of these references, to the extent proper, render obvious independent claims 1 and 16, or any of their respective dependent claims 3, 7-15 and 17.

Application No. 10/797,382
Response dated June 29, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated March 31, 2009

Docket No.: 20811/0204770-US0

Accordingly, withdrawal of the respective rejections of claims 1, 3 and 7-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on respective combinations of Ittycheriah, Wactler, and Besling is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, it is believed that remaining claims 1, 3 and 7-17 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any unpaid fees deemed required in connection with this submission, including any additional filing or application processing fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or 1.17, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 04-0100.

Dated: June 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant